



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/531,527	04/15/2005	Jianming Xu	139360USPCT	9098

Alcatel  
Intellectual Property Department  
3400 W Plano Parkway  
M/S LELG2  
Plano, TX 75075

EXAMINER
----------

RAMPURIA, SHARAD K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2617

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

06/17/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-5 & 19-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Britt; Margaret et al.** [US 6226517 B1] and **Slutsman; Lev et al.** [US 6058313 A] further in view of **Mazzarella; Nick J. et al.** [US 6819921 B2].

As per claim 1, **Britt** teaches:

Art Unit: 2617

An automated method for minimizing call setup delay for a call in a communication network, wherein the communication network includes a central node connected to a number portability database (Abstract), the method comprising:

triggering a first query to the central node for information for routing the call when a request for setting up the call is received by a switching unit; (Col.4; 25-43, Col.1; 49-Col.2; 19)

triggering a second query from the central node to a home location register for the routing information in order to set up the call; (Col.4; 44-56) and

**Britt** doesn't teach specifically, triggering a third query from the central node to the number portability database for the routing information if the second query fails to provide the routing information. However, **Slutsman** teaches in an analogous art, that triggering a third query from the central node to the number portability database for the routing information if the second query fails to provide the routing information. (Col.5; 54-Col.6; 17, Col.4; 3-29, Col.8; 16-25) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to including triggering a third query from the central node to the number portability database for the routing information if the second query fails to provide the routing information in order to provide a method for enhancing call processing in a number portability environment. In particular, the invention reduces post-dial delay enabling faster attempts at routing calls to portable numbers.

The above combination teaches all the particulars of the claim except wherein the number portability database contains a database containing information on each of the wireless networks having different technologies needed for a call set-up procedure. However, **Mazzarella** teaches in an analogous art, that wherein the number portability database contains a database containing

Art Unit: 2617

information on each of the wireless networks having different technologies needed for a call set-up procedure. [e.g. checking database for new network connection; Col.2; 60-66, Col.3; 29-56]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to including wherein the number portability database contains a database containing information on each of the wireless networks having different technologies needed for a call set-up procedure in order to provide a method of porting of a wireless number for a mobile station.

As per claim 2, **Britt** teaches:

The method of claim 1 further comprising selecting the home location register from a first table accessible to the central node, wherein the home location register is selected based on a mobile station ISDN and a state of a flag. (Col.3; 20-43)

As per claim 3, **Britt** teaches:

The method of claim 1 further comprising searching a second table for a location routing number before triggering the second query, wherein the second query is only triggered if the location routing number is not found in the second table. (Col.3; 33-43)

As per claim 4, **Britt** teaches:

Art Unit: 2617

The method of claim 1 wherein the home location register has a number portability mapping database for mapping ported numbers, wherein each mobile phone known to the home location register is identifiable by its mobile station ISDN number, and wherein triggering the second query includes searching number portability mapping database for a mobile station ISDN number associated with the call. (Col.3; 20-43)

As per claim 5, the above combination teaches all the particulars of the claim except wherein the call is made from one wireless communication network to another network. However, **Mazzarella** teaches in an analogous art, that the method of claim 1 wherein the call is made from one wireless communication network to another network. [Col.2; 60-66]

**Claim 19** is the **system** claim, corresponding to **method** claim 1 respectively, and rejected under the same rational set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 1 respectively, above.

As per claim 20, **Britt** teaches:

The telecommunications system of claim 19 further comprising a number portability database (NPDB) connected to the central node, and instructions for querying the NPDB if no match is found after searching of the first and second tables. (Col.3; 20-43)

As per claim 21, **Britt** teaches:

The telecommunications system of claim 19 further comprising a network switch in communication with the central node, wherein the network switch is adapted for querying the

Art Unit: 2617

central node for routing information when the switch receives a request to set up the call. (Col.3; 20-43)

*Claims 22-23* are the **method, system** claims, corresponding to **method** claim 5 respectively, and rejected under the same rationale set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 5 respectively, above.

#### ***Response to Remarks***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5, 19-23, have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment (For illustration; since newly amended claims modified the above-disclosed rejection) necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sharad Rampuria whose telephone number is (571) 272-7870. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F. (8:30-5 EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dwayne Bost can be reached on (571) 272-7023. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000 or

*EBC@uspto.gov.*

/Sharad Rampuria/  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2617